

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.	:	09/829721	Confirmation No.	8452
Applicant	:	Glenn R. Smith, et al.		
Filed	:	April 10, 2001		
TC/A.U.	:	2178		
Examiner	:	Gregory J. Vaughn		
Title	:	TEXT ENTRY DIALOG BOX SYSTEM AND METHOD OF USING SAME		
Docket No.	:	SVL92001005US1		
Customer No.	:	46158		

RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

(In response to Paper No. 20071023/Mail Date October 25, 2007 and
Paper No. 136/Mail Date November 13, 2007)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is filed in response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed on October 25, 2007 and to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed on November 13, 2007. It is respectfully submitted that both Notifications contain similar and duplicated requirements and that this paper is fully responsive to both Notifications.

Accordingly, the Brief having been amended as provided herein is in compliance with the Rules under 37 C.F.R. §41.37 and should be forwarded again to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

REPLY TO BOARD'S STATEMENTS

An "Order Returning Undocketed Appeal to Examiner" was issued by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on 10/18/2007, requiring the examiner to:

- 1) hold the Appeal Brief filed 10/23/2006 defective; 2) notify appellants to submit a paper which corrects the Appeal Brief; 3) acknowledge and consider the paper, and
- 4) facilitate any further action required. The "Order Returning Undocketed Appeal to Examiner" dated 10/18/2007 is repeated below:

Appellant filed an Appeal Brief dated October 23, 2006, in response to the Final Rejection mailed March 20, 2006. The Appeal Brief is not in compliance with 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(v), effective September 13, 2004. The "Summary of Claimed Subject Matter" section appearing on page 2-4 of the Appeal Brief filed October 23, 2007, is deficient. Dependent claims 3, 7 and 15 contain "means for" language. An explanation of the claimed subject matter for each dependent claim argued separately (claims 3, 7 and 15) must be included as well as mapping to the specification by page and line number.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that not all of dependent claim 3 contains "means for" language and that none of claim 15 contains "means for" language. More particularly, claim 3 recites:

3. (Original) The text entry dialog box system according to claim 2, further comprising:
a parser for parsing the text items as parsed text items prior to storage in the memory; and
means for selectively storing the parsed text items in said memory based on the parsed text item containing at least one character.

Further, claim 15 contains no "means for" language as it recites:

15. (Previously presented) The method according to claim 8, wherein the step of displaying the drop-down list selection button includes:
displaying a drop-down arrow button on the screen of the display device in association with the dialog box.

Therefore, applicants do not concede that all of claim 3 is in a "means for" format or that claim 15 contains or could be interpreted as containing "means for" language.

REPLY TO NOTIFICATIONS

When the Office holds the brief to be defective solely due to appellants' failure to provide a summary of the claimed subject matter as required by 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v), an entire new brief need not, and should not, be filed. Rather, a paper providing a summary of the claimed subject matter as required by 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v) will suffice.

Accordingly, responsive to the Notification of October 25, 2007 and to the Notification of November 13, 2007, applicants present only summaries of the claimed subject matter as to claims 3, 7 and 15 below in the form of insertions into the original Appeal Brief dated October 23, 2006.

Regarding claims 3 and 7, please insert into or otherwise add at page 3, line 3 the following to the Appeal Brief filed on October 23, 2006:

--The invention of claim 3 is directed to a text entry dialog box system as described above in connection with claim 2 and comprising a parser and means for selectively storing. The parser 102 is shown in Figure 5. The parser 102 provides for parsing free-form text entry prior to storage in a memory, the storing being conditional on the parsed entry containing at least one character (page 7, lines 8-10). A memory 82 is shown in Figure 5 and selectively stores the parsed text items in the memory based on the parsed text item containing at least one character. The user-supplied text entry may be directly stored in the memory 82 for later recall through a list box selection routine 98. Preferably, however, the text is first parsed by text parser 102 which may be application-specific and may perform typical text parsing functions such as stripping, leading and/or trailing spaces or converting a number to a preferred format (page 14, lines 1-4).

The invention of claim 7 is directed to a text entry dialog box system as described above in connection with claim 3 and further includes means for initializing the memory as empty each time the associated window is started (page 7, lines 13-14). The memory 82 which stores the previously entered text entries is initialized in a step 84. Preferably, the initializing 84 involves emptying memory 82 of any previous contents so that initially there are no previous text entries in the memory 82 (page 12, lines 20-22). This is shown in Figure 5 as dashed functional or control lines extending from the initialized memory block 84 to the memory block 82 and from the text parser 102 to the memory block 82.--

Regarding claim 15, please insert into or otherwise add at page 3, line 16 the following to the Appeal Brief filed on October 23, 2007:

--The invention of claim 15 is directed to a computer implemented method for facilitating input of text by an associated user using a dialog box on a screen of a display device that is connected to the computer as described above in connection with claim 8, wherein the step of displaying the drop-down list selection button includes displaying a drop-down arrow button on the screen of the display device and associated with the dialog box (page 7, lines 10-13). The number of entries stored previously in a memory is counted, and based on the result of the counting step, a selection button is selectively displayed on the screen of the display device. The selection button is preferably a drop-down arrow button, although other button types may also be employed (page 7, lines 18-21). A means is provided for selectively displaying a drop-down selection arrow conditional upon the selection list containing at least one entry (page 8, lines 18-19). Figures 4(c) and 4(d) show a drop-down selection button 70. In the case of the improved dialog box, a drop-down selection button 70 additionally appears as shown in Figure 4(c). The drop-down selection button is absent in the prior art text entry box since previous text entries cannot be recalled in the prior art text entry dialog box (page 11, lines 10-14).--

CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments and amendments/insertions respectfully requested to be added to the previously filed Appeal Brief, it is respectfully submitted that this paper is fully responsive to the notifications recently received from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Applicants respectfully request that the Board consider this Appeal Brief as being supplemented by the enclosed response and to be fully compliant with the Rules, and move this case toward allowance.

Allowance of all claims and early notice to the effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By /Michael E. Hudzinski/
Michael E. Hudzinski, Reg. No. 34185

38210 Glenn Avenue
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7808
(216) 566-9700